



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/003,072	12/06/2001	Bart Alfons Peter Van Doorselaer	Q67388	4879

7590 02/09/2005
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3213

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/003,072

Applicant(s)

VAN DOORSELAER ET AL.

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 9/23/04.

This action is final.

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, and 9 are independent claims.

In the Amendment, filed on 9/23/04, claims 1-12 were amended, and claim 13- 25 were added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, and 13-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borman et al. ("Borman") U.S. Patent No. 6,226,655 in view of Eftekhari (US 2002/0024505).

As per claim 1, Borman teaches a web browsing device, for selecting a specific hyperlink from a set of one more hyperlinks included in a hypertext document, each hyperlink of the set referring to a web resource, said web browsing device comprises:

association holding part, adapted to store an association for each of the hyperlinks in the set, the association associating each of the hyperlinks with a corresponding description (see Borman, column 8, lines 9 -17) and a user direct select action (see Borman, column 7, lines 5 - 11) ;

Art Unit: 2174

association presenting part coupled with an input to an output of the association holding part and adapted to present for each of the hyperlinks in the set the corresponding description and user direct select action (see Borman, figure 3, items 312 - 320, figure 5C, items 508 - 514, column 7, lines 5 - 11 and column 8, lines 22 - 42);

a user direct select action detecting part, adapted to detect an activation of the user direct select action (see Borman, column 9, lines 1 - 8); and

a hyperlink determination part, coupled with an input to an output of the user direct select action detecting part and adapted to determine the specific hyperlink from the association holding part based on the detection of the activation of said user direct select action (see Borman, column 9, lines 1 - 8).

However, Borman fails to teach associating hyperlink with distinct user direct select action;

Eftekhari teaches associating hyperlink with distinct user direct select action (paragraph 16);

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Eftekhari's teaching with method of Borman in order to provide user with a selection method and apparatus to reduce repetitive keystrokes.

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Borman and Eftekhari teach the device of claim 1 (see rejection above). Borman further teaches the web browsing device according to claim 1, characterized in that said browsing device further comprises an association holding updating part, coupled with an output to an input of the association holding port and adapted to update the association of the hyperlinks by assigning a different hyperlink and corresponding description to a user select action previously associated with one of the hyperlinks in the set (see Borman, column 7, lines 5 - 11 and column 11, lines 62 - 66; it is inherent that the hot link

, Art Unit: 2174

associated with the "next entry" and "previous entry" buttons will be updated when the user moves to a new hot link in the list of hot links).

As per claim 13, Borman and Eftekhari teach the device of claim 1. Borman further teaches wherein the corresponding description associated with a hyperlink describes the web resource referred to by the hyperlink. (col. 8, lines 1-14)

As per claim 16, Borman and Eftekhari teach the device of claim 1, Borman further teaches wherein the association presenting part presents the hyperlinks including the description corresponding to each of the hyperlinks in a browser window. (col. 8, lines 1-14) Eftekhari teaches presenting part presents the hyperlinks including distinct user direct select action corresponding to each of the hyperlinks in a browser window displayed on a display device. (paragraph 16).

As per claim 19, Borman and Eftekhari teach the device of claim 1. Borman teaches the association holding part stores each of the hyperlinks in the set including the description corresponding to each of the hyperlinks. (col. 8, lines 1-14) Eftekhari teaches storing part presents the hyperlinks including distinct user direct select action corresponding to each of the hyperlinks in a browser window displayed on a display device in table. (paragraphs 15 and 16).

As per claim 22, Borman and Eftekhari teach the device of claim 19. Borman teaches the association holding part stores only the hyperlinks that are currently displayed on a display device, including the description corresponding to each of the hyperlinks. (col. 8, lines 1-14; It is

, Art Unit: 2174

inherent that all internet related documents are temporary stored in the cache memory) Eftekhari teaches storing part presents the hyperlinks including distinct user direct select action corresponding to each of the hyperlinks in a browser window displayed on a display device in table. (paragraphs 15 and 16).

As per claims 5, 6, 13, 17, 20, and 23 they are of similar scope to claims 1, 2, 14, 16, 19, and 22 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claims 9, 10, 15, 18, 21, and 24 they are of similar scope to claims 1, 2, 14, 16, 19 and 22 respectively, and are rejected under the same rationale.

As per claim 25, Borman and Eftekhari teach the device of claim 1. Eftekhari further teaches:

Wherein pressing a first key activates a first user direct select action associated with a first hyperlink and pressing a second key activates a second user direct select action associated with second hyper link, and

Wherein the second hyperlink occurs after the first hyperlink in the hypertext document (paragraphs 15 and 16).

Claims 3, 7 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 1031;a) as being unpatentable over Borman et al. ("Borman") U.S. Patent No. 6,226,655 in view of Eftekhari (US 2002/0024505) further in view of Grant, U.S. Patent No. 5,854,624.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 1, Borman and Eftekhari teach the device of claim 1 (see rejection above). They fail to teach a web browsing device according to claim 1,

Art Unit: 2174

where each distinct user direct select action is a predefined keystroke. Grant teaches wherein user direct select action is a predefined keystroke (see Grant, column 3, lines 7 - 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Grant with the method of Borman and Eftekhari in order to provide a quicker means of executing frequently used functions.

As per claims 7 and 11, they are of similar scope to claim 3 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 4, 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borman et al. ("Borman") in view of Eftekhari (US 2002/0024505) further in view of Scott et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,101,473.

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Borman and Eftekhari teach the device of claim 1 (see rejection above). They fail to teach a web browsing device according to claim 1, wherein each distinct user direct select action is a predefined spoken word or phrase. Scott teaches wherein user direct select action is a predefined spoken word or phrase (see Scott, column 3, lines 6 - 11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Scott with the method of Borman and Eftekhari in order to provide a quicker means of executing frequently used functions.

As per claims 8 and 12, they are of similar scope to claim 3 and are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISOR OF EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100